GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2017

AS (NEW)
ENGLISH LANGUAGE - COMPONENT 1
B700U10-1

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2017 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

EDUQAS GCE AS ENGLISH LANGUAGE - COMPONENT 1

SUMMER 2017 MARK SCHEME

General Advice

Examiners are asked to read and digest thoroughly all the information set out in the document *Instructions for Examiners* sent as part of the stationery pack. It is essential for the smooth running of the examination that these instructions are adhered to by **all**.

- Make sure that you are familiar with the assessment objectives (**AOs**) that are relevant to the questions that you are marking, and the respective **weighting** of each AO. The advice on weighting appears in the Assessment Grids at the end.

- Familiarise yourself with the questions, and each part of the marking guidelines.

- The mark scheme offers two sources of marking guidance and support for each Section:

  – **'Overview' and 'Notes' on the material which may be offered in candidate responses.**
  – **Assessment grid, offering band descriptors, and weightings for each assessment objective.**

- Be positive in your approach; look for details to reward in the candidate's response rather than faults to penalise.

- As you read the candidate's response, annotate using details from the Assessment Grid/Notes/Overview as appropriate. Tick points you reward and indicate inaccuracy or irrelevance where it appears.

- Decide which band **best fits** the performance of the candidate **for each assessment objective** in response to the question set. Give a mark for each relevant AO and then add each AO mark together to give a total mark for each question or part question.

- Explain your mark with an assessment of the quality of the response at the end of each answer. Your comments should indicate both the positive and negative points as appropriate.

- Use your professional judgement, in the light of decisions made at the marking conference, to fine-tune the mark you give.

- It is important that the **full range of marks** is used. Full marks should not be reserved for perfection. Similarly there is a need to use the marks at the lower end of the scale.

- No allowance can be given for incomplete answers other than what candidates actually achieve.

- Consistency in marking is of the highest importance. If you have to adjust after the initial sample of scripts has been returned to you, it is particularly important that you make the adjustment without losing your consistency.

- Please do not use personal abbreviations, as they can be misleading or puzzling to a second reader. You may, however, find the following symbols useful:

E	expression
I	irrelevance
e.g. ?	lack of an example
X	wrong
✓	possible
?	doubtful
R	repetition

> The following guidelines contain an overview, notes, suggestions about possible approaches candidates may use in their response, and an assessment grid.
>
> The mark scheme should not be regarded as a checklist.
>
> Candidates are free to choose any approach that can be supported by evidence, and they should be rewarded for all valid interpretations of the texts. Candidates can (and will most likely) discuss parts of the texts other than those mentioned in the mark scheme.

Section A: Spoken Language of the Media

	AO1	AO2	AO4
Section A	15 marks	15 marks	20 marks

1. **Analyse the language used by the respective speakers in Text A and Text B to comment on their teams' performances.** **[50]**

In your response you should:
*   explore how the speakers use language distinctively to convey their feelings about the matches.
*   explore how the spoken language features reflect each speaker's attitudes and opinions.
*   include some discussion of similarities and/or differences between the two texts.

There will be a range of different approaches to this question, but discussion should focus on how the speakers present their views and the kind of language they use. Responses should apply appropriate methods of language analysis, and should show critical understanding of spoken language concepts and of a televised post-match analysis as a distinct genre. Since AO4 is worth two-fifths of the marks for this question, connections across the texts should be explored. Look for and reward all valid discussion.

Overview
Text A shows a post-match analysis by José Mourinho, the Chelsea Football Club manager at the time, where he uses the opportunity afforded him to mount a wide ranging critique of his club's current crisis and his perception that his team's performance has been weakened by media scrutiny (line 14) which has damaged player confidence. He claims that officials, including the referees, are scared of treating his team fairly, punishing them whenever the opportunity arises, and making decisions that adversely affect the outcomes of his team's matches. Mourinho is defiant, but there are non-fluency features typical of spoken language in such situations, and perhaps reflecting his status as a second language speaker. Nevertheless, his delivery suggests he is confident in expressing his deeply-held convictions. Text B shows a similar post-match analysis, this time by the coach of the Manchester Thunder women's netball team, Tracey Neville. Unlike Mourinho, Neville demonstrates a lack of experience in this situation, which is reflected in the higher frequency of non-fluency features and her reliance on cliché. Like Mourinho, Neville considers how factors off the pitch, such as the complexity of selecting her best starting team, have contributed to the outcome of the game.

Notes
The following notes address features of interest which may be explored. This is not a checklist. Look for and alternative valid interpretations/approaches.

Genre
- The situation, e.g. a televised post-match analysis, the first one being of a defeat and the second one being of a victory.
- The function of the coach/manager as the figurehead representing their respective clubs in front of the press.
- The surprising increase of non-fluency in Text B compared to Text A, e.g. Neville's non-fluency, with unintentional repetition, e.g. l11/12 *we, we have been at times tends to.*
- The importance of engaging the audience(s) and understanding the different ways in which these audiences might perceive the contributions of the speakers.
- The similarities in the ways the speakers refer to their respective teams, e.g. use of proper nouns in Text A *Chelsea* and in Text B, *Manchester Thunder*, the use of plural noun phrases, e.g. *my players* in Text A and *the girls* in Text B; and the use of the collective noun phrases *the team* in Text A and *a ... squad* in Text B.

Prosodics
- An awareness of similarities regarding rising intonation, i.e. to draw attention to key points.
- The relative monotone pace of Text A contrasted to the varied pace of Text B.
- An awareness of the differences in pitch, e.g. raised to show incredulity, bitterness and irony in Text A, and the surprisingly more monotone delivery (considering the team has won) in Text B, perhaps reflecting Neville's lower self-confidence (possibly gender related) in the situation when compared with Mourinho's natural ease in the situation.
- An awareness of the similarities/differences regarding emphatic stress, e.g. to draw attention to key adjectives (e.g. **hu:::ge** and *good*) key nouns (e.g. *decisions* and *fans*) key verbs (e.g. *collapse)* – used more extensively by Mourinho in Text A in order to strengthen his strategy of creating a siege mentality, defending himself and his team from what he perceives to be attacks from the media.
- Changes in intonation and pitch reflecting Mourinho's defiance in Text A.
- Tracey Nevill's idiosyncratic rising intonation in declaratives, perhaps reflecting a lack of ease, e.g. *we need to start "fine-tuning"* (Text B).
- Strategic use of micropauses in Mourinho's speech either for rhetorical effect, or perhaps a reflection on his status as a non-native speaker of English (Text A).
- Use of micropauses by Tracey Neville, reflecting hesitancy (Text B).

Register
- Relative levels of formality in Text A and in Text B.
- Creation of a combative mood in Text A and a positive mood in Text B.
- Terms of address, e.g. addressing the media directly in second person pronoun *you* (line 14) using first person plural pronoun *we* to align himself with his team and its fans, and the use of the singular first person pronouns *I* and *me* in Text A; similarly, in Text B, Neville's use of the first person plural pronouns *us* and *we* to create a sense of the team's collective ethos, and her use of *I* to establish her sense of leadership and responsibility.
- Terms of address to establish the formality of the context, e.g. full names in in Text A, to refer formally to a player, *Diego Costs*; noun phrases, e.g. *Champions League* (Text A) and *Super League* (Text B) and conventional use of initialism in Text A, *FA*.

Lexis and semantics

- Subject-specific words linked to the focus of the event: abstract nouns linked to sport, such as *game* in Text A and *play* (line 1) in Text B; nouns related to individuals and groups, such as *fans* and *manager* in Text A and *youngsters* and *coaches* in Text B.
- Subject-specific words associated with sports officiating, such as the plural noun *referees*, the plural abstract nouns *decisions* and *penalties* in Text A.
- Subject-specific words associated with strategy and tactics, such as the plural noun *substitutes* and the abstract nouns *attack, systems* and *opposition* in Text B.
- The semantic field of victimhood through the passive voice in Text A, e.g. *we are punished* and *Diego Costa is suspended* and *we are not given a penalty.*
- *Adjectives to reflect enormity and significance of key events in Text A, e.g.* **hu:::ge** *and* GIANT *and to reflect the positive play of Neville's team in Text B, e.g.* enjoyable*.*
- *Emphatic use of repeated numericals in Text A, e.g.* one and one and one and one*.*
- Use of cliché in Text B, e.g. *bees round honey pot* (idiomatic).
- Informal language: elison, e.g. *it's time to be* (Text A and *I've said to the girls (Text B).*
- Modification: evaluative, e.g. *good players, bad players, a bad moment, clear penalties* and *a crucial moment (*Text A*)* and *some really good netball (Text B)* informative, e.g. *an individual mistake* in Text *A* and *that top four* in Text B.
- Adverbs, e.g. Text A - *mentally, psychologically* (manner) Text B - *collectively* (manner) *really* degree.
- Figurative language, e.g. Text A - *collapse* (metaphor) Text B - *hit* (metaphor).
- Dynamic verbs, e.g. *repeat* and *collapse* in Text A *hit* and *push* in Text B.

Form and structure (typical of genre)

- Incomplete utterances, e.g. Text A – I.6 *we don't get (.)* (non-fluency) Text B I.1 *opportunity to s. expose* (reformulation) and I.8 opp. *Like the opposition* (incomplete utterance) and I.11 *we, we ... tends* to *(*non-standard*).*
- Non-standard use of adjective instead of adverb in Text A, I.20 *the team is unbelievable down* to reflect non-native speaker.
- Grammatical patterning in Text A*, e.g. put us down, you are so down, unbelievable down* (II.4/20) *players deserve it* and *Chelsea fans deserve it* (I.9) and in Text B *really worked really well* (I.14) and *it was quite enjoyable ...* (I.2) and *really enjoyable* (I.2).
- Some complex utterances and loose co-ordination in Text A and in Text B.
- Hypophora in Text A, e.g. (I.11) *why because.*
- Ellipsis in Text B for concision, e.g. omission of subject and verb in I.1 *flow of play* and I.1 *opportunity to s. expose a lot of players.*
- Grammatical mood, e.g. declarative comment clauses in Text A I.1 *I think* and I.7 / *repeat* (for control, asserting dominance, emphasising personal opinion) interrogative in Text A I.18 *do you know ↑why↑* declarative in Text B I.6 *we need to start* and I.8 *it's about*.
- Second language features in Text A, e.g. *we are in the top* (I.2 preposition) *the team collapse* (I.19) past-tense ending omitted.

Pragmatics

- Contrasting public personas of José Mourinho and Tracey Neville.
- Shared knowledge, e.g. *Diego Costa* in Text A.
- Shared knowledge of the respective teams' position in their leagues.

Assessment Grid Component 1 Section A

BAND	AO1 Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression. 15 marks	AO2 Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use. 15 marks	AO4 Explore connections across texts, informed by linguistic concepts and methods 20 marks
5	**13-15 marks** • Intelligent methods of analysis. • Confident use of terminology. • Perceptive discussion of texts. • Coherent and effective expression.	**13-15 marks** • Detailed understanding of concepts (e.g. post-match analysis). • Perceptive discussion of issues (e.g. representation of teams, bias). • Relevant and concise textual support.	**17-20 marks** • Subtle connections established between texts. • Perceptive overview. • Effective use of linguistic knowledge.
4	**10-12 marks** • Appropriate methods of analysis. • Secure use of terminology. • Thorough discussion of texts. • Expression generally accurate and clear.	**10-12 marks** • Secure understanding of concepts (e.g. post-match analysis). • Some focused discussion of issues (e.g. representation of teams, bias). • Consistent apt textual support.	**13-16 marks** • Purposeful connections between texts. • Focused overview. • Relevant use of linguistic knowledge.
3	**7-9 marks** • Sensible methods of analysis. • Generally sound use of terminology. • Competent discussion of texts. • Most accurate expression with some lapses.	**7-9 marks** • Sound understanding of concepts (e.g. post-match analysis). • Sensible discussion of issues (e.g. representation of teams, speakers' personae). • Generally appropriate textual support.	**9-12 marks** • Sensible connections between texts. • Competent overview. • Generally sound use of linguistic knowledge.
2	**4-6 marks** • Basic methods of analysis. • Using some terminology with some accuracy. • Uneven discussion of topic. • Straightforward expression, with technical inaccuracy.	**4-6 marks** • Some understanding of concepts (e.g. post-match analysis). • Simple discussion of issues (e.g. representation of teams). • Some points supported by textual references.	**5-8 marks** • Some basic connections between texts. • Broad overview. • Some valid use of linguistic knowledge.
1	**1-3 marks** • Limited methods of analysis. • Limited use of terminology. • Some discussion of texts. • Errors in expression and lapses in clarity.	**1-3 marks** • One or two simple points made about concepts (e.g. post-match analysis). • Limited discussion of issues (e.g. representation of teams). • Limited textual support.	**1-4 marks** • Some links made between texts. • Vague overview. • Undeveloped use of linguistic knowledge with errors.
0	**0 marks:** Response not credit worthy or not attempted		

COMPONENT 1 Section B: Written Language

	AO1	AO2	AO3
Section B	15 marks	15 marks	20 marks

2. **Analyse and evaluate the use of language in the text to present the watch. [50]**

In your response you should explore:
* how language is used to promote the changing appeal of the watch.how language is used to convey the watch's usefulness for military men.

There will be a range of different approaches to this question, but discussion should focus on the use of language to present the watch. Responses should apply appropriate methods of language analysis and should show critical understanding of the linguistic concepts underpinning promotional writing. Since AO3 is worth two-fifths of the marks for this question, the ways in which contextual factors and language features shape meaning should be addressed. Look for and reward all valid discussion.

Overview
An unusual text, which appears to be written from the perspective of the wrist watch *(I am the wrist watch)*. Aimed at soldiers and other armed forces personnel, the text is entertaining, creative and social enlightening in its approach to promoting the watch as a useful accessory *(I point to the hour)* and an essential item of military kit *(on the wrist of every line officer)*. There is a lexical set of military language *(trenches, bullets, bombs, guards, sentry, war, action)* relating to the varied functions of the watch. As a contrast to its earlier gender associations – in previous times, the wrist watch was associated with female fashion *(I was the mark of the woman)* and feminised male fashion *(I was also worn by the lounge-lizards ...)* – in its current presentation, the watch is made desirable and re-invented *(behold me ... revivified, re-glorified)* as a piece of military equipment that no 'real' man could afford to be without. Since its rebranding, men would not be embarrassed to be seen wearing it *(the friend of every officer and every man)*.

The following notes address features of interest which may be explored. This is not a checklist. Look for and credit alternative valid interpretation/approaches.

Medium
* The use of headline to introduce the conceit of the piece adopting the point of view of the watch.

Content
* The cyclical organisation of the content, beginning and ending with the same simple declarative sentence *I am the wrist watch.*
* Semantic field of fashion, e.g. *handkerchiefs, highly-polished canes, bejewelled.*
* Predominantly opinion, e.g. *ridiculed, indispensable, social shame; very few facts*, e.g. *True to the Greenwich Observatory.*

Register
- Relatively formal tenor, e.g. standard English used throughout; polysyllabic lexis; no elision (e.g. *I am ...)* dated, e.g. *behold, haberdashers, monocle* (contextual factors).
- Although there is no direct address and the entire text is in the first person, the relationship between reader and writer is informal because the text is entertaining and is based around a humour conceit – that the watch is speaking for itself.
- Lexis used suggests a specific target audience, i.e. soldiers who are aware of gender stereotypes of wearing watches, yet mindful too of the newfound and varied functionality and efficacy for their own work and the work of others in the armed forces (e.g. *line officer, guards, surgeons, husky artillerymen*).

Lexis and semantics
- Abstract nouns and noun phrases which create a sense of military knowledge and expertise, e.g. *the front, the attack.*
- Concrete noun phrases which demonstrate an insight into battle, e.g. *the barrage of bullets and bombs (*post-modified*) the front line trenches (*pre-modified*)*
- Lexis associated with gender, e.g. noun phrase *their dainty wrists*; adjectives *bejewelled and fragile.*
- Use of first-person pronouns to establish a strong sense of voice, e.g. complements used to convey the watch's ubiquity, e.g. *present.*
- Evaluate objectives*, e.g. *dainty* and *highly-polished* (feminised fashion) *husky, hairy* (masculinity) *phosphorus* (scientific) *practical* and *useless* (efficacy).
- Present tense stative verbs (*I am*) to emphasise its current status rather than its former associations expressed through the past tense, e.g. *hung* implies a sense of passivity compared to the current potency.
- Figurative language, e.g. personification (*... witness ... chronicler ... instructor ... arbiter ...*) metaphor (*lounge-lizards*).
- Determiner *the* to convey the uniqueness of the wrist watch (... *the wrist watch).*
- Adverbs of time (*now, forever*) and adverbials of time (*before the war*) to suggest the changing status of the watch.

Form and structure
- Pre-modified noun phrases to suggest differences in the watch's use, e.g. *the pampered poodle type of useless ornament, their dainty wrists* (female) *the hairy forearms of husky artillerymen* (male) pre-modified noun phrases associated with imperial power *my rigid and imperious sway*.
- Simple sentences, e.g. *I am the wrist watch* (repeated for rhetorical effect) *I was the mark of the woman.*
- Fronted co-ordinating conjunctions, e.g. *But now–behold me* ... are used to convey the new military use of the watch.
- Listing, e.g. asyndetic *the instructor, the arbiter, the consoler, the friend ...* (varied nature of the relationship between the watch and the men who will wear it) syndetic *... by stage comedians, by cartoonists of the press, by haberdashers and men's outfitter of all sorts* (past status of the watch).
- Parentheses, e.g. *in this war* (to emphasise the urgent need to own and wear a watch *the once-despised* (to indicate the change in the watch's status among men).
- Patterning, e.g. *they <u>all</u> wear me, they <u>all</u> swear by me* (to underline the watch's universal appeal) *I mount <u>guards.</u> I dismiss <u>guards</u>* (emphasising the power of the watch).
-
- Subordination, e.g. *as he stands, waist deep in water ...* (to show the practical usefulness of the watch in war situations the male soldier reader would recognise).
- Use of the passive voice, e.g. *I was ridiculed* reflecting former lack of power and potency) versus the active voice *I mount guards* (reflecting newfound potency and power).

Pragmatics
- Published in the *stars and stripes*, a newspaper aimed at armed forces personnel.
- References to gender stereotypes.
- References to fashion.
- References to empire, e.g. *imperious sway.*

Assessment Grid Component 1 Section B

BAND	AO1 **Apply appropriate methods of language analysis, using associated terminology and coherent written expression.** **15 marks**	AO2 **Demonstrate critical understanding of concepts and issues relevant to language use.** **15 marks**	AO3 **Analyse and evaluate how contextual factors and language features are associated with the construction of meaning.** **20 marks**
5	**13-15 marks** • Intelligent methods of analysis. • Confident use of terminology. • Perceptive discussion of texts. • Coherent and effective expression.	**13-15 marks** • Detailed understanding of concepts (e.g. opinion piece). • Perceptive discussion of issues (e.g. social status and attitudes). • Relevant and concise textual support.	**17-20 marks** • Confident analysis of contextual factors. • Productive discussion of the construction of meaning. • Intelligent evaluation.
4	**10-12 marks** • Appropriate methods of analysis. • Secure use of terminology. • Thorough discussion of texts. • Expression generally accurate and clear.	**10-12 marks** • Detailed understanding of concepts (e.g. opinion piece). • Perceptive discussion of issues (e.g. social status and attitudes). • Consistent apt textual support.	**13-16 marks** • Secure analysis of contextual factors. • Thorough discussion of the construction of meaning. • Purposeful evaluation.
3	**7-9 marks** • Sensible methods of analysis. • Generally sound use of terminology. • Competent discussion of texts. • Most accurate expression with some lapses.	**7-9 marks** • Sound understanding of concepts (e.g. opinion piece). • Some focused discussion of issues (e.g. social status and attitudes). • Consistent apt textual support.	**9-12 marks** • Sensible analysis of contextual factors. • Generally clear discussion of the construction of meaning. • Relevant evaluation.
2	**4-6 marks** • Basic methods of analysis • Some accurate terminology. • Uneven discussion of texts. • Adequate expression, with some accuracy.	**4-6 marks** • Some understanding of concepts (e.g. opinion piece). • Simple discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes). • Some points supported by textual references.	**5-8 marks** • Some valid analysis of contextual factors. • Simple discussion of the construction of meaning. • Some attempt to evaluate.
1	**1-3 marks** • Limited methods of analysis. • Limited use of terminology. • Some discussion of texts. • Errors in expression and lapses in clarity.	**1-3 marks** • Some simple points made about concepts (e.g. opinion piece). • Limited discussion of issues (e.g. attitudes). • Limited textual support.	**1-4 marks** • Some awareness of context. • Limited sense of how meaning is constructed. • Limited evaluation.
0	**0 marks:** Response not credit worthy or not attempted		

B7000U10-1 EDUQAS GCE AS Eng Lang Comp 1 NEW MS Summer 2017/JF